

NOV 30 2004

Docket No.: VAS-5041CIP2

<b>Certificate of Mailing/Transmission (37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)):</b>	
[ ] Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I hereby certify that this paper and all enclosures are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the date indicated below in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.	
[ X ] Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d), I hereby certify that this paper and all enclosures are being sent via facsimile on the date indicated below to the attention of Examiner Brian E. Pellegrino at Facsimile No 703-872-9306.	
Dated: November 30, 2004	Name of Person Certifying: Printed Name: <u>Guy Cumberbatch</u>

## BEFORE THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Shannon

) Group Art Unit: 3738

Application No.: 09/997,829

) Examiner: Brian E. Pellegrino

Filing Date: November 29, 2001

For: RADIALLY EXPANDABLE  
TUBULAR STENT GRAFTSMail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. §41.37

Dear Sir:

This is an appeal from the final rejections of claims 103-119 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,700,285 to Myers, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,131,648 to Choi, et al. For the reasons discussed below, Applicants request reversal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

The Notice of Appeal was filed on October 4, 2004, making this Appeal Brief timely.

i.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Edwards Lifesciences Corporation of Irvine, California.

Application No.: 09/997,829  
Filing Date: November 29, 2001  
Appeal Brief filed November 30, 2004  
Responsive to Final Office Action Dated June 2, 2004

ii.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences.

iii.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 103-119 stand rejected and appear in the attached claims appendix.

iv.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

An Amendment After Final under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 was filed on November 29, 2004 containing no claim amendments. That amendment merely canceled the priority claim.

v.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The invention in sole independent claim 103 pertains to an implantable drug eluting device including a radially expandable stent having a polymer/therapeutic substance coating on a wall surface thereof, and a tubular outer layer comprising PTFE tape wound about the outer surface of the stent. The stent and tubular outer layer are described, for example, in paragraph [0092], while the coating is described at paragraph [0093]. FIGS. 4a-4f are step-by-step illustrations of a preferred method for manufacturing a drug eluting radially expandable tubular stented graft, some of which may be used in the construction of a drug eluting device as defined in claim 103.

Application No.: 09/997,829  
Filing Date: November 29, 2001  
Appeal Brief filed November 30, 2004  
Responsive to Final Office Action Dated June 2, 2004

vi.

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

- 1) Whether claims 103-105, 107, and 113-117 are not patentable under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,700,285 to Myers, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,131,648 to Choi et al.
- 2) Whether claim 106 is not patentable under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being obvious over Myers, et al. in view of Choi et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,287, 285 to Michal, et al.
- 3) Whether claims 108-111 are not patentable under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being obvious over Myers, et al. in view of Choi et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,053,940 to Wijay, et al.
- 4) Whether claims 108-110, and 112 are not patentable under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being obvious over Myers, et al. in view of Choi et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,117,165 to Becker, et al.
- 5) Whether claims 118, 119 are not patentable under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being obvious over Myers, et al. in view of Choi et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,749,880 to Banas, et al.

vii.

ARGUMENT

- 1) Rejection of claims 103-105, 107, and 113-117 over Myers et al. in view of Choi et al.

Applicant respectfully submits that Myers in combination with Choi does not render the pending claims obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, primarily because the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has held that "[t]he PTO has the burden under section 103 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness...It can satisfy this burden only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one

Application No.: 09/997,829  
Filing Date: November 29, 2001  
Appeal Brief filed November 30, 2004  
Responsive to Final Office Action Dated June 2, 2004

of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references.” In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1595, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no basis which would support the combination of Myers and Choi to make the pending claims obvious. The Examiner is correct in asserting that Choi teaches an erodible coating that comprises a therapeutic agent. However, the Examiner’s assertion that Choi teaches an implantable device coated with an erodible polymer is incorrect. Choi teaches that the erodible polymers disclosed in Choi “can be made into” implantable devices (see Choi, col. 28, ll. 15-17) but that is very different from coating an implantable device such as a stent-graft with a drug-containing polymer. Thus, Choi offers no teaching of coating an implantable device with the erodible polymers that it discloses.

Needless to say, Choi offers no suggestion whatsoever that a stent or graft can be coated with the polymers disclosed in Choi. In fact, Choi does not once mention either the term “stent” or the term “graft.” Therefore, Choi provides no motivation that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Choi with Myers to make the claimed invention obvious.

“The examiner bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.” ; In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Only if the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness is met by the Examiner, does the burden of coming forward with rebuttal argument or evidence shift to the applicant. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). When the references cited by the examiner fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the rejection is improper and will be overturned. Fine, 837 F.2d at 1074, 5 USPQ2d at 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In re Deuel, 51 F.3d 1552, 1556, 34 USPQ2d 1210, 1214 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

**Combinations of known elements are patentable.** Even if the Examiner had cited references containing all the elements of the claims, that would not preclude patentability. A new combination of elements can be patented “whether it be composed of elements all new,

Application No.: 09/997,829  
Filing Date: November 29, 2001  
Appeal Brief filed November 30, 2004  
Responsive to Final Office Action Dated June 2, 2004

partly new or all old.” Rosmount, Inc. v. Beckman Instruments, Inc., 727 F.2d 1540, 1546, 221 USPQ 1, 7 (CAFC 1984). In fact:

Most patentable inventions combine old elements. **The fact that a patent combines teachings from prior art references is irrelevant to the legal determination of obviousness under § 103 and the factual inquiries set forth in Graham ....** “The critical inquiry is whether ‘there is something in the prior art as a whole to suggest the desirability, and thus the obviousness, of making the combination.’” Fromson v. Advance Offset Plate, Inc., 755 F.2d 1549, 1556 [ 225 USPQ 26, 31] (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citation omitted) (emphasis in original) .... Intra Corporation v. Hamar Laser, 662 F. Supp. 1420, 1440-1441, 4 USPQ2d 1337, 1352, 1353 (E.D. Mich. 1987), citations omitted, emphasis added; aff’d, 862 F.2d 320 (CAFC 1988)(unpublished).

**Prima facie obviousness requires a specific motivation to combine references.** “To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant’s disclosure. In re Vaack, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).” MPEP 2142.

**No specific motivation to make the claimed combination has been provided.** Case law requires that the Examiner provide a specific motivation in the art for combining known elements in order to establish obviousness of the combination.

“[C]ase law makes clear that the best defense against the subtle but powerful attraction of a hindsight-based obviousness analysis is rigorous application of the requirement for a showing of the teaching or motivation to combine prior art references. ... Combining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching, or motivation simply takes the inventor’s disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability—the essence of hindsight. ... [Evidence of a suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine] must be clear and particular. ... Broad conclusory statements regarding the teaching of multiple references, standing alone, are

Application No.: 09/997,829  
Filing Date: November 29, 2001  
Appeal Brief filed November 30, 2004  
Responsive to Final Office Action Dated June 2, 2004

not 'evidence.' ... [A] reference-by-reference, limitation-by-limitation analysis fails to demonstrate how the [cited] references teach or suggest their combination ... to yield the claimed invention," and a conclusion of obviousness based on such an analysis "as a matter of law, cannot stand." In re Dembiczak, 175 F.3d 994, 999, 1000, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

No clear, particular suggestion or motivation in the prior art to make the specific combination of a stent, a polymer-therapeutic substance coating on the stent and a PTFE tape wrapped on the outside of the stent as recited in the pending claims has been provided. In the absence of a specific suggestion in the prior art, a rejection identifying individual elements of the claimed combinations is based merely on hindsight in light of Applicant's disclosure. *Prima facie* obviousness has not been established under such conditions, and a rejection based on such an unmotivated combination of references will not stand as a matter of law.

Myers, et al. merely discloses a tubular intraluminal graft comprising a tubular, diametrically adjustable stent having an exterior surface, a luminal surface and a wall having a multiplicity of openings through the wall, and a tubular covering of porous expanded PTFE film affixed to the stent. There is absolutely no mention of incorporating a therapeutic substance (i.e., a drug) into the intraluminal graft.

Choi, et al. on the other hand, discloses generally a polymer formulation in which a "beneficial agent" is incorporated. The polymers exhibit a controlled degree of the erosion in an aqueous environment and thus can be used for making devices and coatings for releasing a beneficial agent as the polymers erode. However, Choi, et al. offer no suggestion that a stent or graft can be coated with the polymers disclosed. Various examples in Choi, et al. are given, none of which include a stent or graft. For example:

In FIG. 3, a device 10 prepared by using a polymer of the invention, is used for administering a systemically active drug and has an exemplary square shape with dimensions of 3" x 3" x 10 mil.

In FIG. 4, a device 10 is seen for administering an agent 13 at variable rates over a period of time. Device 10 is a multilayered structure comprised of two outer layers 14 and 16, distant from each other with a layer 15 positioned between layers 14 and 16. An agent 13 is dispersed in each layer and it can be the same or different in the layers.

Application No.: 09/997,829

Filing Date: November 29, 2001

Appeal Brief filed November 30, 2004

Responsive to Final Office Action Dated June 2, 2004

FIG. 5 illustrates another device 10 used as a means for delivering an agent 13 including a drug. Device 10 consists of two layers 14 and 15, each formed of a different polymer having a different bioerosion rate. Layer 14 consists of a polymeric matrix containing a plurality of cells 17 dispersed throughout the matrix. An agent 13 is present in cells 17, which agent is dissolved in a liquid 18 that is a solvent for the agent and a nonsolvent for the polymer. Layer 15 contains particles of a different agent 13 dispersed therein. When device 10 is placed in the environment of use, for example against an animal organ, or in a body cavity, layer 14 gradually bioerodes and releases dissolved agent 13 to the surrounding tissues.

FIG. 6 illustrates a device 10 formed of a bioerodible polymer 12 comprising a multiplicity of microcapsules 19 with each microcapsule having a wall 20 made of an agent release rate controlling material. An agent 13 is housed within microcapsules 19.

In FIG. 7, a device of aid in the healing of injuries is shown comprising a support base layer 21 formed of a breathable impervious material such as cellophane, rubber or polyethylene and the like, with a bioerodible solid polymer 12 containing agent 13, a drug, fixed to base 21. Device 10 is useful for administering drug 13 to the skin, mucosa or an exposed wound.

FIG. 8 depicts a pharmaceutical device particularly adapted for use as a depot implant. Depot implant 10 is manufactured for administering a drug 13 and it is comprised of a pair of layers 14 and 16 having sandwiched therebetween a single layer 15. One advantageous use of the implant is in surgical operations accompanied by severe pain after the operation is completed and the patient regains consciousness. In these cases, when the body is opened for the operation, an implant containing an analgesic can be implanted into the body during the operation to ease pain as it bioerodes and releases the analgesic drug throughout the recovery period.

FIGS. 9 and 10 illustrate devices for delivering drug, which devices have several variables that may be manipulated to control the rate and period of drug release. Referring first to FIG. 9, there is illustrated a device 10 having a cylindrical shape and a passageway 20 extended through the center of device 10 in parallel alignment to the cylindrical axis of device 10. Device 10 is made of a bioerodible polymer 12 for releasing drug within a vagina. Passageway 20 is a means for manipulating the amount of drug released from device 10 by increasing the surface exposed to the fluid of the environment of use thereby influencing the amount of drug released over bioerodible time. FIG. 10 illustrates another means for manipulating the rate and period of drug release from a device 10, and it provides the medical profession with a device for insertion into the natural cavities of the animal body 24, such as the anus 25, where it releases a drug for promoting healing effects.

Referring to FIGS. 11a and 11b, a device 10 is shown for placement in a human eye including an ocular insert 10 consisting of a bioerodible polymer 12 comprising a continuous matrix having particles of drug dispersed therethrough.

Application No.: 09/997,829  
Filing Date: November 29, 2001  
Appeal Brief filed November 30, 2004  
Responsive to Final Office Action Dated June 2, 2004

5 In FIG. 12, there is graphically illustrated a device 10 for releasing a drug 13 within a uterus 36 having sides 37 and a fundus uteri 38. Device 10 as shown in cross-section, is a bioerodible intrauterine device having a round tube shaped body made of bioerodible polymer 12 that contains drug 13 for release in uterus 36 concurrently with the bioerosion of polymer 12.

There is no example of a stent or graft in the many embodiments of Choi, et al.

As the cited references do not teach all the elements of the pending claims, and no specific motivation in the prior art to modify and combine the references has been provided,  
10 *prima facie* obviousness has not been established. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

#### 2-5) Other Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

15 The Examiner rejected various other claims under § 103 by combining Myers and Choi with various other references. As the foregoing shows, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case for combining Myers with Choi to render the pending claims obvious. Therefore, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case for combining Myers with Choi and then further with a third reference. Furthermore, the claim rejections herein are only of claims dependent on claim 103. Because Applicant has shown above that claim 103 is patentable over Myers in view  
20 of Choi, all the claims dependent on claim 103 are also patentable.

viii.

#### CLAIMS APPENDIX

25 Claims 103-119 pending at the time of the Final Office Action are attached hereto as an appendix.



Application No.: 09/997,829  
Filing Date: November 29, 2001  
Appeal Brief filed November 30, 2004  
Responsive to Final Office Action Dated June 2, 2004

**FEES**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the Appeal fee under 37 C.F.R. §§41.20(b)(2) to Deposit Account No. 50-1225.

If an appropriate payment does not accompany or precede this submission, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees, such as under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, including any petition for extension of time, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1225.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

November 30, 2004



Guy Cumberbatch, Reg. No. 36,114  
Telephone: (773) 857-7634  
c/o Rajiv Yadav, Ph.D., Esq.  
Registration No. 43,999  
Edwards Lifesciences LLC  
Law Department  
One Edwards Way  
Irvine, California 92614  
Telephone: (949) 250-6807  
Facsimile: (949) 250-6850  
Customer No.: 30452